Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/611,367	WHITE ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Patricia L Engle	3612
All Participants: Status of Application:		
(1) <u>Patricia L Engle</u> .	(3)	•
(2) <u>Kathryn Marra</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: 17 September 2004	Time: <u>4 pm</u>	
Type of Interview:		
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed:		
Claims discussed: 1 and 2		
, and <u>-</u>	`	
Prior art documents discussed:  Bailey		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:  See Continuation Sheet		
Part III.		
<ul> <li>☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview</li> </ul>		
directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. Provided a written summary in Part II above.  It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.		
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applicant/	Applicant's Representative Si	gnature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner suggested incorporating claim 2 into claim 1 to put the case in condition for allowance. Examiner stated that she would maintain the Bailey rejection of claim 1, because the term "unitary" only requires that the outer panel be a unit (which could be made of several parts). Claim 1 was added to claim 2 so that the claims depending from claim 2 would not have to be amended. Kathy Marra requested that the term "unitary inner panel" be changed to --inner panel--. The Examiner agreed.